THE NEW REPUBLIC

The President *vs.* Steel

Charles A. Reich

On Resuming Nuclear Tests

Morton H. Halperin

BERLIN TALKS	*The Editors*
HUXLEY'S ISLAND	*Patrick O'Donovan*
DJILAS IN JAIL	*M. Dobos*
FRANCE WAITS	*Jean Daniel*

April 30, 1962, 25

EARL C SECREST
4816 ARDEN WAY
CARMICHAEL CALIF
S-63 D10553 R4-18

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T.R.B. *from Washington*

Third Force

★ The amusing Republicans after standing in frozen uncertainty all during the steel battle suddenly found voice eight days after it was over and keened their woe to the high heavens, not at the issue itself but at the brutal fashion in which Kennedy had slapped down Big Steel! Maybe we are crazy but somehow we keep thinking the Congressional GOP is soft in the head. One of us must be wrong.

It keeps happening this way. The Republicans have analyzed and re-analyzed the 1960 election and keep coming up with the same answer: they must increase their strength in the big cities. So what do they do? – they unite to defeat the Urban Affairs bill which proposed a cabinet department to help the cities.

Now take steel. Republicans are accused of being the party of Big Business so they jump to the defense of Roger Blough (after he has capitulated) and say that Kennedy shouldn't have been so tough in holding the anti-inflation price line. It doesn't strike us as a winning issue.

A lot of people don't realize that an odd thing has happened in this country: inflation is halted. Take our word for it (we just looked it up) the average of wholesale prices was 100.4 in 1958, and in mid-March this year it was 100.7. Cost of living has gone up a little more but not very much. For the moment we have price stability. This had a lot to do with the steel crisis.

Everybody always says they want price stability, but it isn't an easy thing to live with. Inflation is stimulating. If you know steel prices are going up you buy ahead, all you can. Kennedy says steel prices are not going up; immediately Detroit puts purchases on a hand-to-mouth basis.

During inflation, steel (which needs investment capital to modernize plants would just up prices, blaming it on higher wages, and consumers would foot the bill. It was a cozy arrangement. Now Kennedy has asserted the right of the Third Force, the public interest, against inflation. Okay, he has won his battle. But that doesn't end Kennedy's economic problems; actually it probably increases them.

The pressure for higher wages is going to continue from unions. This will bite into corporation profits unless they raise prices (Kennedy says "No") or unless they cut production costs (increase worker productivity) by more modern plants. Where do they get the capital for modernization? Well, that's the problem.

It's so big a problem that the economic recovery is slowing down; turning sluggish. Nothing serious, you understand, but ominous for all that. A substitute stimulus for inflation is needed. One is to start spending. (Congress is going to give Kennedy $600 million for emergency works, and it may give him standby authority for $2 billion more.) Another is to cut taxes. (Kennedy wants an 8 percent corporate tax cut as an incentive for plant modernization, and he is going to give faster plant obsolescence schedules which is a kind of tax concession, too.)

Will these moves start inflation again? The GOP is bound to say "yes." Actually, with big excess plant capacity in the US and an army of unemployed, with increasing foreign competition and the fear of gold loss abroad, we would guess that the Administration would keep the country free from inflation. But getting faster growth is a harder problem.

Two Out of Forty

★ As dawn broke September 27, 1961, Congress quit. It was a long session, the longest since 1951, but this year's may be longer.

Of 40 major Kennedy Administration recommendations so far Congress has decided only two (approved Worker Retraining; defeated Urban Affairs) and the first 100 days, formerly considered the half way mark, are over. Now Congress is home for Easter. All of the members of the House face election this fall and will be desperate to get away. They fooled the Senate last year, adjourned *sine die* and left the angry upper house no alternative but to quit, too. Never again! said a grim Senate. It has the power to hold the House to 3-day recesses, broken by roll-calls. How Congress is going to complete its work isn't evident. Senate Finance chairman Byrd doesn't expect to take up the tariff-trade bill till June; Majority Leader Mansfield speaks of "Labor Day" hopefully. Any bill dropped now has to begin next session, from the beginning.

The fact is, Kennedy doesn't expect to get all his bills passed. There are three which, if enacted, will make the session historic. All three now look promising: the Tax bill, the Trade bill and Health Aid for the Aged. Our guess is, as of now, that he will win a version of each.

Notes

★ Should campaign contributions be tax deductible like gifts to charity? President Kennedy's 9-man partisan commission unanimously says "Yes" – up to $1,000. It is a political scientists' dream. American parties are the most incoherent on earth; broadening their financial base would weaken their mortgage to the rich, and channelling the money through central committees (as proposed) should strengthen discipline and national (as opposed to parochial) direction. . . . Somebody mysteriously slipped an exemption into the pending tax bill making lobbyist costs tax deductible. It is a weirdy, if ever we saw one! Nobody testified for it in committee, nobody debated it on the House floor: it just suddenly appeared, was passed, and the Senate has it now. The Administration opposes. It ought to be killed. . . . We disliked Kennedy's use of the FBI in the steel crisis. J. Edgar Hoover has never been one of our heroes; in fairness we don't know whether he or Bobby or somebody else ordered the nocturnal questioning of newsmen. There is a temptation for a bunch of cops, burning with a sense of righteousness and Hoover's constant warnings against Communism, to go to extremes. They hold terrifying power and we still want to make sure that 36-year-old Bobby is a safe custodian for it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW REPUBLIC *A Journal of Opinion Volume 146 Number 18 Issue 2478 April 30, 1962*
Published weekly (except for omissions of four summer issues) and distributed by The New Republic, *1244 19th St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Phone: FEderal 8-2494. Single copy 25c. Yearly subscription, $8.00; Foreign, $9.00, Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Advertising rates upon request. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Include old and new address. Copyright© 1962, by Harrison-Blaine, Inc. Item g. Second class Imprint, reading Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Indexed in* Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

New Berlin Talks

THE WEEK

3. New Berlin Talks; West German Doubts; Disarmament Package; "Realism" in Peking; Teachers on Strike; Money and Elections; Footnotes to the Week

ARTICLES

8. Another Such Victory . . . by Charles A. Reich

11. Why Djilas Is in Jail by M. Dobos

13. France – Waiting to Begin by Jean Daniel

15. On Resuming Nuclear Tests by Morton H. Halperin

DEPARTMENTS

17. Books 18. Records 19. Art 20. Theater 22 Correspondence

THE STAFF

Gilbert A. Harrison, Editor & Publisher
Selig S. Harrison, Managing Editor
Robert Evett, Books & the Arts Editor
Christopher Jencks, Associate Editor
Mary Newcomb Allen, Research
F. R. Ruskin, Assistant to the Publisher

Contributing Editors:

Alexander M. Bickel, Robert Brustein, Asher Brynes, Helen Fuller, Frank Getlein B. H. Haggin, Morton H. Halperin, Irving Howe, Sidney Hyman, Gerald W. Johnson, Stanley Kauffmann, Helen Hill Miller, Michael Straight

If Bonn had not pulled the rug out from under the Secretary of State, he would on April 16 have handed Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin two position papers on Berlin. The meeting took place, it was "cordial," but the "Rusk proposals" were temporarily withheld. After a hastily summoned caucus of Chancellor Adenauer and party leaders on the night of April 13, these secret papers had been leaked to Sydney Gruson and his wife, Flora Lewis, and to two German papers – *Die Welt* and the *Westdeutsche Allgemaine*. Subsequently, a full account appeared in the *Rheinische Post*, a Christian Democratic newspaper close to the Foreign Office. Thus, two days before Mr. Rusk met Ambassador Dobrynin in Washington, the White House and the State Department had found their plans reported accurately (with one exception – an erroneous statement on proposed troop reductions in Berlin) in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*. The leaks were of German origin; they were intended to circumscribe negotiations from the start. The Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs lodged a strong protest; the President was described as "furious." And what had Bonn accomplished? The reverse of what it wished. By publicizing American views it bound the US more securely to them. For Russians too read newspapers.

Then Bonn hurried to butter the burn. It said that the "government" was not responsible for the press briefing and expressed absolute confidence in Washington's handling of forthcoming talks. The denial was pure semantics: the term "government" meant the Cabinet – and the leaks did not come from a Cabinet member. But under a parliamentary system, the party leaders of the governing coalition are part of the government. Nobody has denied that Herr von Brentano, leader of the Chancellor's party in the Bundestag (who will visit Washington at the end of this month, following on the heels of Prime Minister Macmillan) may have been the source, though nobody has dared name him publicly either. It is an open secret that the former Foreign Minister is not on good terms with his successor, Gerhard Schroeder, and that he was unhappy over the "flexibility" Schroeder displayed when he met Secretary Rusk in Lausanne before the opening of the disarmament conference last month. At that unpublicized meeting, Schroeder raised no objection to Rusk's desire to broaden the base of talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko. Did Dr. Adenauer not fully grasp the significance of this? Possibly, for the Chancellor will be 87 next January. Moreover, he has always hoped

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

West German Doubts

Bonn

The day after details of the four-point plan for Berlin drawn up by Dean Rusk were leaked here, Dr. Adenauer slipped off to his holiday resort of Badenabbia in Northern Italy. He has maintained a diplomatic silence ever since. The Foreign Minister has somewhat ostentatiously busied himself with the affairs of the Common Market and the budding European Political Community. It is a near-certainty, however, that forces in the West German government are working against any compromise solution. The near-certainty is made more plausible by the publication on April 19 in the Dusseldorf newspaper, *Der Mittag*, of a "Peace-Treaty Proposal," which is understood to have been drawn up with the blessing of official circles. It is the work of a "Study Group" which has been meeting in Frankfurt, and the man largely responsible is Professor Theodor Oberlaender, who was Adenauer's Minister for Refugee Questions in two successive governments and who was induced to resign because of public criticism. (He was a former Nazi Party member and "Eastern Affairs" expert who took part in the wartime occupations of Poland and the Soviet Union.) Three weeks ago, Dr. Adenauer wrote Oberlaender, congratulating him on his "political rehabilitation" (all legal proceedings against him had been dropped.) The choice of Oberlaender as chief drafter of a proposed peace-treaty must have been made long ago. It is a remarkable choice.

The "Proposal" lays down that a German Peace Treaty must follow free, all-German elections, that there shall be no settlement of Germany's Eastern frontier until democratic elections are held throughout Central Europe (Poland and Czecho-Slovakia included), and that an All-German army should have the right to carry and use nuclear weapons and the right to choose its allies!

But there are voices being lifted up on the side of compromise. The *Koelner Stadtanzeiger* has published a surprisingly brave article calling for recognition of the need for an "interim arrangement" that would allow democratic freedoms to the 17 million East Germans in return for leaving Germany indefinitely divided, dropping all frontier demands and providing a zone of limited, non-nuclear armaments (in fact, something like the Rapacki plan.)

The mood in Bonn is one of doubt and confusion. There is no real indication from the government as to what sort of "agreement in principle" might be acceptable. There will be repercussions within West Germany if the Rusk proposals lead to an interim arrangement for Berlin, and some disappointment if the talks fail.

Terence Prittie

to confine negotiations to "Berlin only," fearing that any consideration of wider questions of European security might compromise the Federal Republic.

So the new round of Rusk-Dobrynin talks began under strange circumstances. Nothing will be decided without Bonn's consent, but the pressure on Bonn to consent is strong. And though the West Germans have said that they were given only 48 hours to comment on ideas they claimed were new in essential details, Washington says these were only a slight re-writing of ideas which had been discussed between Rusk and Gromyko in Geneva – with full knowledge of Bonn.

There is a center piece in the "Rusk proposals," and there are peripheral parts intended, for the most part, to tempt the Russians to buy the center piece – an international authority controlling access to West Berlin. The essence of the plan first put forward by President Kennedy in his interview with Khrushchev's son-in-law and then accepted in principle by Gromyko in Geneva, lies in there being an international guaranty of unimpeded access. Whether this "authority" would exercise any responsibility for military traffic of the four powers is doubtful.

At present, land and water routes to the city are controlled almost entirely by East Germans. Air traffic is subject only to four-power safety control and Soviet attempts to enlarge this to traffic control have been resisted. The new authority would consist of the four powers which, on the basis of their rights of conquest, have responsibility for Berlin. West and East Germans would be represented as observers, or simply technical advisers. This is less "recognition" of the Ulbricht regime than the Russians would like, and to make it more palatable, "neutral" representatives might be included in the "authority." Washington and London believe that a clarification and re-affirmation of access rights are worth some concessions, and thus four other ideas have been placed in the package.

Declarations of non-aggressive intent between the Warsaw Pact and NATO nations carry an implication of indirect recognition of the Oder-Neisse border between East Germany and Poland, and of the Berlin Wall demarcation line. Such declarations stop short, however, of formal recognition of the *status quo*.

An agreement against the proliferation of atomic weapons would amount to a promise by the Western powers that Germany would never become an independent atomic power. But it does not rule out West German partnership in NATO.

Mixed German committees are a device to give East Germany a form of "respect" without "recognition." Technical committees of East and West Germans are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already dealing with interzonal trade problems and handling various common services (water, electricity). Contacts would be neither widened nor narrowed; they would, however, be raised from the administrative to the governmental level. A mixed committee might work out procedures looking toward reunification – for instance, an all-German election law. This would be an academic exercise for the present, but it would build connecting tissue between the two Germanies.

Measures against surprise attack could include an inspection zone in Central Europe, or only an exchange of military information to avoid miscalculation or accident. (Even now, East and West maneuvers are mutually announced so as to prevent their being mistaken for aggressive preparations.)

Bonn's objections to a deal along these lines have not been made public. Nevertheless, it is known that the West Germans are afraid an international "authority" over access would give too much status to the East Germans. This is not only a legalistic argument against "recognition": the mere presence of East Germans at a West Berlin airport or in the Air Safety Center might enhance the prestige or power of the Communist regime and thus, Bonn believes, endanger the freedom of the city. This fear would have more substance if it were not for the fact that access today is anything but secure, and that the danger of Russian or East German interference with traffic is made no greater by an international reaffirmation of access rights.

No objections have been raised by Bonn to "nonaggression declarations," though new arrangements for "European security" do arouse anxiety. The idea of an "inspection zone" in the middle of Europe, or of an East-West agreement on atomic weapons has always been suspect. Most West Germans are against Soviet inspectors on their soil.

An agreement to prevent West Germany's becoming an atomic power is also incompatible with the earlier determination of Defense Minister Strauss to give West German armed forces more control over atomic weapons than is now contemplated. In recent weeks, however, Strauss has soft-pedalled this theme and it is possible that some compromise can be worked out within NATO that strengthens the grip of West Europeans on the atomic safety catch, without placing more fingers on the trigger.

Finally, the Rusk proposals for establishing mixed German committees is accepted in Bonn, but without joy. And no opposition is expected to regular, formal consultations among Deputy Foreign Ministers.

To be fair to the West Germans, one must understand that their attitude is different from that of the French. Bonn will go along with the US because it knows, as the President told reporters on April 18, that Berlin is "a very dangerous area [that] could blow up at any time" and that the "vital interests" of the US and the USSR are involved. The West Germans cannot veto the President's "probes in order to determine whether there is an effective basis for high negotiations," especially since the US is irrevocably committed to maintaining the freedom of West Berlin.

What the "new" approach means fundamentally is that the West has, for all practical purposes, given up the effort to depict reunification of Germany as a feasible diplomatic objective for the foreseeable future. Partition has been accepted as a "fact of life," though this cannot and will not be officially admitted.

Disarmament Package

If inspection is the real obstacle to a disarmament agreement, the incorporation of Louis Sohn's zone-by-zone inspection scheme into the April 18 US proposals should prove a major step forward. But if the inspection squabble is a side show, and the real problem is that neither side is willing to abandon the advantages of its present military posture, the new proposals are no more promising than their predecessors.

Both the US and USSR would, in Stage One of the treaty Arthur Dean set forth at Geneva, reduce military manpower to 2.1 million men – a cut of about 700,000 men in US forces and 1.3 million for the USSR. The US decrement could probably come largely from the ranks of civil engineers, clerk typists, entertainment groups, and other essentially civilian units, so that combat effectiveness would remain at its present level. The USSR, having less fat, would have to pare more muscle; and in view of the fact that the Soviet Army is now so much larger, even if it had as much fat as the US Army, the reduction would clearly be to the US benefit. The further recommendation that other nations' armed forces be limited to one percent of national populations would mean a slash in East European but not West European forces.

If these proposals were matched by unilateral Western cut-backs in nuclear striking power, the package might be more attractive to both sides. According to Secretary McNamara the US as of last November could deploy more than 630 B-52's, 55 B-58's, 1,000 B-47's, several dozen ICBM's, 80 Polaris missiles, and 300 carrier-borne aircraft armed with megaton weapons. The USSR, according to P. M. S. Blackett's evaluation in the April *Scientific American*, has only about 200 ICBM's and long-range bombers, plus perhaps 450 medium range bombers which might be used for one way missions against the US. If these comparisons are even approximately correct, the USSR's sole intercon-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinental nuclear objective must be to deter a US attack by maintaining a capability large enough so that extensive damage to the US is guaranteed. To cut this force from 200 to 140 might bring it perilously close to inadequacy even if the US cut its forces to 1,400.

If Mr. Dean can peddle this package, or anything resembling it, he deserves to replace Ambassador Thompson in Moscow. Apparently he has no such hopes. He is planning to buy a house in Geneva.

"Realism" in Peking

What little is known of the Sino-Soviet trade pact for 1962 signed on April 20 and of the new Chinese economic program announced several days earlier in Peking seems to confirm prevailing Administration judgments concerning the severity of the rift between Moscow and Peking. Prophecies of a trade embargo by the Russians and of a total political rupture have not materialized. But little of substance has changed to ease relations; and the emotional distance between the two capitals has, if anything, grown greater than at any time in the past.

The announcement of the trade pact pointedly omits mention of the value of the petroleum and manufactured products which the Russians are to provide in exchange for raw materials. There is not a hint of a reference to Soviet credits covering Chinese repayment. Much has been made in some press accounts of the absence of specific indications that China will be required to ship food to the Soviet Union this year, suggesting, as some see it, that the Russians are relaxing their demands for early repayment of the $300 million in short-term indebtedness incurred by the Chinese outside of the framework of agreed-on credit arrangements. This is only the second year of the five-year grace period granted by the Russians, however, and the fact that food has not been cited could mean that the deficit for 1962 is to be made up by shipments of other items, or simply that the provisions concerning food were conveniently left out of the Peking announcement.

The new 10-point economic program released at the conclusion of the National People's Congress gave the world belated formal notice of Chinese economic difficulties and of the consequent necessity for avoiding a complete break with the Russians. Although much of the substance of the program has been implicit in bits and pieces of evidence coming out of Peking for more than a year, the reversal of economic priorities by the regime at the expense of heavy industry has for the first time been made explicit. Food and cloth shortages are to be attacked through increased attention to grain and cotton production. "The Great Leap Forward" has at last been given a decent public burial.

Perhaps a more noteworthy aspect of the Peking proceedings is the studied propaganda emphasis on China's nationalism, unity and self-sufficiency. In place of the Stalinist tone of the Communes phase, the "national bourgeoisie" is now treated with solicitude; the continuation of government interest payments on nationalized properties for three more years was promised by Chou En-lai. Appointment of a non-Communist (former Kuomintang General Tsai Ting-kai) as vice-chairman of the Defense Council also suggests a "realistic" or "conservative" shift in strategy.

The strategy is expected to mean, for the present, a somewhat less acerbic dialogue between Moscow and Peking; but in the long run, the accent on national solidarity and self-sufficiency would seem to foreshadow a more rather than less independent line.

Teachers on Strike

Last winter New York's teachers won, for the first time in American educational history, the right to bargain collectively with a school board. On April 11, the bargaining process having failed to produce the $600-1,000 salary increases which the United Federation of Teachers demanded, between half and three-quarters of New York's 44,000 teachers struck. On April 12, faced with an injunction under New York's Condon-Wadlin law (which bars strikes by public employees), they returned to work.

Before the strike, the school board had maintained that it did not have enough money to meet the teachers' demands; after the walk-out, however, Governor Rockefeller found an additional $13 million in state funds to help boost salaries, and it now seems probable the teachers will get much of what they wanted. As a result of their victory, collective bargaining and new strikes are likely to occur elsewhere.

To many, including both the National Education Association and the overwhelming majority of school board members, a teachers' strike is an outrage, not just because the teachers are public employees, but because they are irreplaceable professionals deserting helpless children. Some critics of the New York City strike went so far as to compare it to a doctor abandoning a patient because he couldn't pay his bills.

The analogy is inexact. A pupil who misses a day (or even a month) in school does not die, or even suffer greatly. Indeed, comparative studies of school years of various lengths have usually shown no correlation between cutting a few days out of the program and the amount pupils learn by June. Those injured most by teacher-enforced holidays are parents, who have to make other arrangements for taking care of the chil-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dren from 9 to 3. It is hard to see why teachers have any less right to achieve their ends by inconveniencing the public than, say, striking steelworkers.

Far from sacrificing New York City's children to the selfish interests of the teachers, the strike in the long run was probably the only way to assure that their interests were not sacrificed to the tax-conscious property owners and commercial interests which set the educational budget. If the New York strike raises salaries sufficently to halt migration of the city's best teachers to suburbia, it will do pupils more good in the long run than the work they missed on April 11 could have done.

Year after year, in city after city, the NEA has urged teachers to seek their objectives by negotiation and persuasion. Naturally school boards have concurred. But the result has been a school system which most competent teachers admit is a disgrace, and which many leave in disgust for other occupations; a system in which professional standards are sacrificed to economy, and in which the majority of teachers think, act and get paid like minor white collar bureaucrats. Only in a handful of upper-middle class suburbs does the community understand and support the kind of schools teachers are willing and able to provide. In other districts, the one way to prevent millions of children from remaining half-educated is for teachers to force the pace. If teachers are to do this they must make the public take them seriously, and there is probably no better way to do this than to stop acting like mice.

Money and Elections

The report of a bipartisan group of five Democratic and four Republican political experts on "improved ways of financing expenditures required of nominees for the offices of President and Vice-President" concentrates its advice on ways to increase the number of small contributors. Ten million Americans footed the whole $165-175 million bill for the cost of campaigns for public office in 1960, the report noted. ($20 million of this was expended in the Presidential campaigns.) "Given the erratic flow of funds and the periodic crises in campaign finance, individuals and organizations providing substantial gifts at critical moments can threaten to place a candidate in moral hock."

To encourage more givers of smaller sums as a corrective, the President's Commission on Campaign Costs calls for tax credits up to $10 annually for gifts to national political parties (or tax deductions for gifts up to $1,000) and repeal of present limitations on campaign expenditures and contributions, placing reliance instead on an improved, strictly enforced system of disclosure of amounts actually given or spent.

Footnotes *to the* Week

PENTAGON FOOTDRAGGING is responsible for the recalcitrance of Phoumi Nosavan in Laos. If he holds out long enough against a neutralist coalition, the utterances of some US military men in Washington are leading Phoumi to conclude, the President will have to renege on the coalition pledge negotiated with the USSR at Geneva. —— NEHRU'S SUCCESS *in getting the Congress Party to ratify his choice of Vice-President Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan as successor to the invalid President of India, conservative Rajendra Prasad, has strengthened the Prime Minister's stand against the Party right wing. Nehru will now have a like-minded ally in the palace for the first time since Independence.* —— A NEW FCC RULING is designed to cut down sharply on the practice of trafficking in licenses which has plagued radio and TV. Henceforth, all applications for station sales – except where pressures are created by some clearly legitimate reason such as an owner's death – will be subject to an automatic hearing if the applicant has operated his station for less than three years. —— THE "CONSCIOUS PARALLELISM" *with which steel companies have arrived at identical prices over the years is less important, in the eyes of Justice Dept. antitrust lawyers, than whether US Steel is too big for the country's good. The special grand jury taking evidence in New York will probably be asked to attack the issue of bigness directly, with the price-conspiracy question subordinated.* —— TENSION IN PAKISTAN is increasing between the central government and East Pakistan (separated from the western wing of the country by more than 1,000 miles of Indian territory). President Ayub Khan will replace his military governor in the province – General Azam Khan – who opposes the Ayub "hard line" for putting down disaffection among Pakistan's Bengali majority of 55 million. —— THE SETBACK IN SUBCOMMITTEE *of Sen. Paul Douglas' "truth in lending" bill is a victory for the lobbyists of the banking and retail industries, even though some large banks and many savings and loan companies feel that the bill, which would require publication of actual interest rates on small loans and credit purchases, would be inconvenient only to the unscrupulous.* —— MAJORITY LEADER Mansfield and Speaker McCormack tried to call a halt on joint sessions of Congress to hear foreign dignitaries. The ban was breached under White House pressure for an exception in the case of Brazil's President Goulart. Congressmen avoided the rite in droves; capital employees and even surprised constituents were drafted to fill in. The House was half-filled when another exception was made for the Shah of Iran. Henceforth the ban will probably hold.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To cut costs and so diminish the need for election funds the Commission recommends suspending Section 315 of the Federal Communications Act again in 1964 as was done in 1960 with respect to the Presidential and Vice Presidential campaigns. Here, and on a variety of proposals for direct government support of election campaigns, the Commission report is diplomatically evasive. Instead of recommending outright repeal of the "equal time" requirement of the Act to vest discretion in the broadcaster or endorsing legislation to require broadcasters to supply a set amount of free time to candidates at the broadcasters' expense, the Commission suggests close study after 1964 of how the industry fulfills its public responsibility in that election.

Federal subsidies for Presidential campaigns may someday become necessary. If so, the report says, a new approach should be considered – a plan whereby funds raised by the national parties would be matched in equal amount from appropriations limited by Congressional statute.

Another Such Victory...

The President's Short War Against Steel

by Charles A. Reich

President Kennedy's triumph over the steel companies has been widely acclaimed as a victory for the ordinary citizen and the public interest. The action of US Steel in unexpectedly raising prices, and that of the other companies in following its lead, have justifiably been called ill-considered and inflationary. Nevertheless, the President's accomplishment in forcing the companies to their knees is one we may come to rue.

When the steel companies announced price rises, thereby shattering the carefully created image of a "non-inflationary" steel labor settlement, the President went into a fury. According to responsible reporters, he regarded the rise as a doublecross, a deliberate flouting of his policies, and a setback for the Administration reminiscent of Cuba. Within a matter of hours, the following things happened:

(1) The President publicly denounced the companies, implying that they had selfishly and unpatriotically put their interests ahead of the nation's interests, while other Americans were giving their lives in battle;

(2) The Department of Justice began an investigation into possible criminal price fixing or monopoly;

(3) A grand jury was convened to investigate the same possible crimes;

(4) Company papers were subpoenaed;

(5) FBI agents, assisting the Department's investigation, awakened witnesses (reporters) in the middle of the night to obtain their statements concerning a matter that was as a matter of fact public knowledge;

(6) The Federal Trade Commission began an inquiry;

(7) Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives announced separate investigations;

(8) It was reported that the Administration was considering legal moves to break US Steel into several smaller units;

(9) It was reported that the Administration was considering legislation to regulate steel prices;

(10) It was reported that the Administration was considering new, stringent antitrust legislation;

(11) It was reported that the Administration was "reviewing" its advocacy of tax legislation favorable to businesses like the steel companies;

(12) The Defense Department announced it would deny contracts to the offending companies; subsequently a contract was awarded to a company which had not raised its prices;

(13) The Administration used informal channels to put heavy pressure on the companies;

(14) The White House held meetings of high officials to consider further government action.

The Chairman of US Steel, Mr. Blough, publicly defended his company's action, insisted that US Steel cared about the public interest as much as the President, and said that the new prices would be maintained. But Inland Steel decided not to raise its prices, and soon Bethlehem and then US and the others capitulated to the President and lowered theirs.

Three days after the companies' surrender, it was reported that the Administration had decided to "de-

CHARLES A. REICH *is Associate Professor of Law at Yale University.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mobilize pressures against the steel industry" and to pursue a policy of live and let live. It was reported further that the Administration might relax the zeal of the grand jury investigation of steel pricing practices, and that the pressure for searching Congressional investigations and new antitrust legislation might also be relaxed.

The next day, Mr. Blough of US Steel called on the President to discuss the industry's future course, and the President was reported willing to make peace in return for the cooperation of the steel industry in holding down prices. At his press conference on the following day, the President said that there was no residue of ill will toward the steel companies, and that the government had no vindictiveness, although the grand jury investigation would go on. He emphasized the areas of agreement between the Administration and the industry, and said that a "mistake" had been retracted. As for the nocturnal FBI calls, all he wanted was "to get the facts." He was, in James Reston's words, magnanimous; but he gave no indication he would not do it all again. In the aftermath, the first question that must be asked is whether the methods used by the President were proper.

The Criminal Investigations. Implicit in the government's headlong speed and mobilization of forces was the notion that the price rise had suddenly and unexpectedly revealed the commission of grave and imminently dangerous crimes – price fixing or monopoly. The fact is that the steel companies' action seemed to disclose nothing that had not been well known for years. Follow-the-leader pricing has been a steel industry practice for decades, and it is hardly unknown in other major industries. If US Steel is a monopoly because of its size and power, it has also been one for decades. It is possible, but far from certain, that the courts would hold that the steel industry's pricing practices violate the antitrust laws, and that US Steel is an unlawful monopoly. But why the frantic, highly publicized, simultaneous investigations? Why the summoning of a grand jury, an action of great consequence which ordinarily takes place only after careful preliminary inquiry and preparation? Why the middle-of-the-night calls by the FBI, to gather evidence of "criminal" activities which for years have been the subject of leisurely and tedious law review articles? One would think the companies were holding a baby for ransom.

It is perfectly true that long tolerated illegal conditions may come under sudden but good faith scrutiny when they appear in particularly outrageous form. But why did the Administration lose its prosecutorial zeal just as soon as the companies capitulated? Can acts or conditions that are criminal on Tuesday become less criminal by the following Monday? Are crimes by steel and other industries permitted so long as the criminals "cooperate" with the Administration?

Threats of Legislation. These threats came in newspaper reports quoting nameless officials; they were heard no more after the companies gave in. If they were meant seriously, they certainly represented nothing new. Proposals to nationalize steel, to regulate its prices or to subject its practices to more stringent antitrust regulation are all familiar to the point of being tiresome. Their dramatic reappearance in the papers was good theater only to those who had not seen the show before.

The Congressional Investigations. Two congressional investigations, piled on top of all of the Administration's activity, could hardly assist in uncovering any additional facts. All that so many investigations could do would be to stumble over each other. Subpoenaed papers or summoned executives cannot be in more than one place at a time. On the other hand, the use of investigations to harass people and businesses and to subject them to pressure is well known. Strangely, those who usually protest such misuse of legislative investigatory power raised no objection when it was proposed to put the steel companies on the congressional rack.

Other Administration Actions. Public denunciations and the strategic deployment of Defense Department contracts are well established Presidential prerogatives. But so immense is their combined power that only the most extreme circumstances can justify their use. A vast segment of the economy is dependent on advertising and good consumer relations which can be severely damaged or utterly destroyed by a single presidential charge of unpatriotic action. Another vast segment is directly dependent on government contracting. The President was using life-and-death powers.

The Propriety of the Administration's Methods. Each of the powers the President used was a legitimate one, and nothing he did was beyond his lawful authority. That is not the issue. The issue is whether the President made proper and responsible use of his powers. The evidence is overwhelming that the actions taken or inspired by the President were primarily for the purpose of intimidating and coercing the steel industry. The previous indulgence of steel industry practices, the use of so many drastic powers in concert, and the willingness to relent after the surrender all confirm this.

Such use of power, whether its objectives are good or bad, is dangerous. Income tax investigations are legitimate, but should they be undertaken specially, with dramatic fanfare, to frighten someone who op-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poses Administration policies? Should a man's passport application be delayed if he does not fall into line on some economic issue? Should the goodwill of a business be destroyed by official denunciation if it proves stubborn in collective bargaining? The very immensity of government power demands, on the contrary, that it be used in a disinterested manner, and only for the exact purposes intended. Any other use gives a President the ability to force people to do things which under the law he has no right to require. It means that people offend the President at their peril.

The spirit of our Constitution is the spirit of limitation on all powers, of disinterested enforcement of the laws, of equal protection, of due process. It was dangerously wrong for an angry president to loose his terrible arsenal of power for the purpose of intimidating and coercing private companies and citizens.

Coercion Without Legislation

The propriety of the President's methods is not the only serious issue raised by his victory. Even if the methods had been proper, his action would raise another question: how far can a president go in demanding, without the authority of legislation, that private business conform to administration policy?

President Kennedy's objective was to require the steel industry to conform to his Administration's policy of "holding the line" on wages and prices. He stated that he was asking every citizen to make sacrifices for his country, and steel was asked to do its share.

That citizens in general, and giant basic industries in particular, should attempt to act in a manner which will promote the common good is beyond debate; society could not exist otherwise. But who is to define the public good? After all, Mr. Blough stated that his company believed that a rise in steel prices was in the public interest. His economic theory, based upon the necessity of plant modernization, is accepted by many people, whether or not it is sound. The President, however, denied Mr. Blough's right to act on his belief, though at the same time he insisted that, "This is a free country . . . they could proceed with freedom to do what they thought was best within the limitation of law." The Administration decided that inflation was bad for the country, that it was possible and desirable to halt inflation by keeping down prices of basic materials, and that it would be good to permit a modest rise in labor costs while maintaining prices at current levels. Perhaps all three propositions are true. But to what extent are citizens denied the right to disagree?

The Congress alone has the power to require citizens and businesses to conform to publicly set policies. It has, for example, given the Executive power over some utility rates. Congress, however, has given the President no power to fix the price of steel, or to require steel pricing to conform to Administration economic policy. When President Truman seized the steel companies, the Supreme Court held the seizure unconstitutional because, although Congress could have given him such power, it had not done so.

Undeniably the President has his own constitutional responsibility to set policy and seek to have it followed. Perhaps his responsibility is particularly great in the steel situation where, realistically, steel is so essential and so monopolistic as to be almost a public utility. Certainly a strong argument can be made that some sort of regulation is essential.

But conceding all of this, the President has no right to *force* his economic policies on an unwilling industry *without legislation*. Unless Congress acts, the fact is that in a free society there can be no unitary public interest, no single, authoritatively fixed idea of "the public good." Freedom has little meaning if it only allows action that "responsibly" conforms to the President's idea of the national interest. He can set national goals and urge others to follow, and in areas of his constitutional authority, like foreign policy, he can command obedience. But in the area of economics, private business and the public have the right to act according to their notion of the public good, until the people's elected representatives decide otherwise.

Even if everything that has just been said about President Kennedy's methods and objectives is wrong, his victory is still disquieting. It demonstrates how much power government has today. Such power, no matter how wisely exercised, is hardly any less frightening because the victim forced to surrender was a group of corporate giants and not a small business or a private citizen.

Who, no matter what his legal rights, will challenge the President hereafter? Most businesses are more, not less, in need of favorable public opinion than steel. A hint of criminal prosecution or official criticism could be fatal. Many other businesses depend more heavily than steel on government contracts; many others owe their existence to a revocable government license. Private citizens, having seen giants felled, are not likely to take on the victor.

Much of what Mr. Kennedy accomplished by pressure of government power he will hereafter be able to command by the subtlest suggestion. The description of the defeated Mr. Blough, calling on the President to find out what the steel industry should do next, is an ominous picture of the future. Will business now come crawling to government to seek its pleasure? And, what is more important, will individual citizens fear to disagree with "national policy"? President Kennedy's victory may have advanced peace and plenty, but it did no service to freedom.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Djilas Is in Jail

Belgrade

The re-arrest of Milovan Djilas at first seemed incredible. Was it possible that the one-time chief Party theoretician and then famous Communist heretic could have broken his truce with Tito no more than 15 months after his recantation and probationary release from prison, or that the Yugoslav Communists, usually hypersensitive to foreign press opinion, would risk such a scandal a mere month after having granted amnesty to some 150,000 refugees living abroad since the end of the war? The charges that Djilas violated the conditions of his parole "by publishing material harmful to the interests of Yugoslavia" are far-fetched.

The facts have filtered out mostly to foreigners; to date there has been no word in Belgrade newspapers about the affair, but the news is spreading slowly by word of mouth.

In March an official ban was placed on the import and sale of the January issue of the Italian magazine, *Tempo Presente*, edited by Ignazio Silone. A story in that issue, entitled "War," purportedly "grossly slandered the Yugoslav War of Liberation and the men and officers who participated in it." The unnamed author was none other than a high-ranking officer in that war, once close in command to Tito himself, Milovan Djilas, an obscure private citizen now writing quietly for foreign periodicals.

Later translated and published in *Encounter* (and later still in the April 16 issue of the *New Leader*), "War" depicts an incident in a fictional, war-torn country in which a peasant, trying to save his third and only remaining son, smuggles him home from the front in a coffin. As he passes a military checkpoint, the father is denounced by a suspicious compatriot ("It's our duty to report anything suspicious, war is war"). The coffin is opened; the live boy discovered. ("Crumpled alongside the coffin, the mother began to brush the sweat-drenched hair away from her son's forehead, comforting him: 'Don't be afraid, my darling boy, he's a good man, he's a good man. He's from our government, the people's government'.") The major in charge of the checkpoint, an officer in the very army in which the boy has been serving, orders him shot as he lies in the coffin. ("In an angry voice, the Major said: 'Now carry him away!' Then he added quietly: 'We do our duty and will continue to do it'.") The box is closed again; the numb parents continue on their way home, carrying the coffin. The officers are not portrayed as brutal sadists, simply as soldiers. The boy was a deserter.

At first glance, the story seems to implicate no one in particular. The locale is not named. It is a humanist, pacifist condemnation of all war. Indeed, such observations could even be deemed permissable or at least tolerable to the Yugoslav Communists whose theoretical position on "war and socialism" (the title of Vice President Edvard Kardelj's polemic against the Chinese) is that war as a policy cannot further the cause of Communism. Still, Djilas leaves the impression that it is a civil war which is raging; it might have reminded the Yugoslavs of their own civil war and have been too familiar for comfort.

Shortly after the banning of the January *Tempo Presente*, a number of articles by noted journalists appeared in West Europe and the United States telling of the planned publication of a new book by Djilas, *Conversations with Stalin*. These conversations, held in 1944-45 and 1948, cover a variety of subjects, notably Balkan affairs and the Chinese situation at that time: Stalin's remarks that Albania should not be an independent Communist state but should be "swallowed up" by Yugoslavia; that the Greek partisans should give up their struggle for power; that he had wrongly counseled the Chinese to make a deal with Chiang Kai-chek, are all recorded. Although the complete contents of the manuscript are not known here, a well-known Swiss journalist claims that the book is not unfriendly to Stalin. Whatever the contents, it can be assumed that Yugoslav authorities had been long aware of them. Not only have certain Party members been assigned to check up on Djilas from time to time, but the author wisely took the precaution of sending the manuscript by mail; it undoubtedly passed through the hands of censors. The representative of Harcourt Brace, the publisher, had been in Belgrade a short while before with a projected layout of the book for Djilas to see. That too could not have escaped the secret police. Finally much of the already-publicized material in the book is not new, having appeared in the official biography of Tito written by Vladimir Dedijer in 1952.

Djilas nevertheless was called in by the authorities during the week the articles about his book appeared in the Western press. He was threatened with imprisonment if he did not withdraw it from publication. Quite typically, his first reaction to the threat was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stormy defiance. But it was no longer merely a charge of parole violation: A law making any government official liable to 10 years imprisonment for divulging information obtained while in government service, the other and more serious charge made against Djilas, had unobtrusively been passed a month earlier, along with the magnanimous decree of mass amnesty. Whether the law was formulated with Djilas in mind is not clear, but he must have known that it applied to him. At a second hearing, Djilas told the police that retracting the book would cost him money he did not have – to which the Yugoslavs responded with an offer to cover damages to Harcourt. Although a telegram from New York tentatively agreeing to suspension of publication was sent Djilas on Friday, April 6, he was taken from his home on Saturday, along with the telegram.

Why? The reasons do not lie with Djilas alone. Perhaps the government's decision to take a second, harsh look at their apostate can best be understood in relation to the two important political events of the past year: Tito's turn to the Soviet bloc; and Khrushchev's final discrediting of Stalin as the foe of coexistence. In this context, it is interesting to note that the visit last week of Andrei Gromyko was kept secret until only a few days before his arrival here on April 16, just nine days after Djilas' arrest. In the context of the ideological dispute raging in the Communist world and of a Soviet-Yugoslav rapprochement, it is not implausible to suspect that the Russians intervened and requested the suppression of *Conversations with Stalin*. One can only speculate on the reasons.

Djilas as an Inadvertant (?) Stalinist

Khrushchev is struggling not only with Red China and Communist factions abroad which are sympathetic to China's more militant line, but in all likelihood with some hard-line opposition at home as well. The resuscitation of anything like a "positive" image of Stalin could discomfit the Khrushchev group. Further, dramatic re-highlighting of Stalin's postwar policies, world publicity for the old stories, and possibly some new ones, could hamper Khrushchev's campaign to equate all opponents of his policy of coexistence with Stalin and his crimes. In its first statement for the foreign press after the arrest, the Yugoslav Secretariat for Information declared that Djilas had permitted material to be printed abroad which served an "anti-Yugoslav campaign." This is a term used exclusively for Chinese attacks on Yugoslav "revisionism." The statement that this material could "serve as an instrument in the cold war at a time when all responsible government statesmen are trying to find possibilities to improve the international atmosphere" appears to mean that in the government's view Djilas, consciously or not, had provided the Chinese and their allies with ammunition to fight Khrushchev.

This is something Tito will not countenance. The Yugoslavs have been increasingly friendly to the Soviet Union. At the time of the Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Nations, several Western newsmen were given to understand by an anonymous, highly placed Yugoslav official that the Titoists intended to aid Khrushchev as much as possible, for they feared his fall from power would mean the ascendency of a tougher and more dangerous leader in the Soviet Union. Although at the time this was taken as a sort of explanation of Tito's wobbly position vis-a-vis Soviet resumption of nuclear tests, Yugoslav willingness to sympathize with Khrushchev's interests was established beyond a doubt. The willingness was reciprocal. Khrushchev can use Yugoslav support, though not if it makes him the target of too heavy an attack for "revisionism" from within the bloc. In order to join forces, then, a few sacrifices were perhaps in order. What better sacrifice than the man who was probably imprisoned the first time for the same reason? The Djilas case began previous to, and continued through, the Soviet-Yugoslav rapprochement of 1955.

How far Djilas was conscious of all these higher machinations is impossible to ascertain. No one can get to him. Some sources contend that he wanted the book published at any price, in spite of the fact that there appears to be no ideological reason for him to do so: Djilas would hardly go out of his way to support the Chinese. These sources say that upon learning that the government might hold him hostage, he promptly made arrangements with other West European companies for the book's publication. Although the picture of a man vehemently plotting his own incarceration seems odd, it nevertheless fits somewhat with the impression all his close associates have had of him. The friend who paid for his loyalty to Djilas with ostracism and poverty, Vladimir Dedijer, referred to him as "hot-headed," attributing his defiant manner to his being Montenegrin. This view of an explosive and erratic personality renders more comprehensible the abrupt and violent turns Djilas has made in his life. The man who once "loved Stalin as a young girl her Valentino," as he put it, became one of the most outspoken critics of Stalin in 1948. The man who left no one far behind in extravagant living as one of Yugoslav's top three leaders, next to Tito, was the same man who castigated the arrogance and privilege of the ruling Party group in *Anatomy of a Moral* in 1953. This ardent Communist then proceeded to rattle the very foundations of his ideology, demanding dissolution of the Communist Party and an end to Leninist concepts. For this he was thrown out of government and Party offices, isolated, and finally jailed in 1954. His persistence was formid-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able: in jail, he allowed the secret removal to the West of the book which contained all his new theories. With the publication of *The New Class* in 1956, he was sentenced to seven more years in prison.

Whether or not it is true that Djilas has chosen, by attempting to present Stalin favorably at the appropriately inappropriate time, to swim upstream again, he is a symbol of resistance to tyranny. The Yugoslavs apparently expect advantage to accrue from the arrest; time will tell whether they benefit enough from cooperation with the Soviets to compensate for the immeasurable damage they have so clearly done themselves in the eyes of the non-Communist world.

M. Dubos

France—Waiting to Begin

by Jean Daniel

With the new government of Premier Georges Pompidou, General de Gaulle intends to inaugurate the second part of his seven-year plan for more resolute action at home and abroad. In some circles it is believed that the new regime is getting off to a poor start, because the President of the French Republic must usher it in by passing on the death sentence decreed for Edmund Jouhaud, one of his most faithful generals. To so believe, however, is to misjudge de Gaulle. So far as he is concerned, the Jouhaud affair is simply, to quote de Gaulle's own words, a whim of fate, a mere vicissitude. A cynical attitude? No. Call it, rather, ingrained discipline, a life-time habit of mind. True, Jouhaud is the first general on whom the death sentence has been imposed for a hundred years; but after all, Marshall Pétain too was sentenced to death under de Gaulle's rule. Strange is the destiny of this French soldier who has instigated the two most significant crises in the French army since the Dreyfus affair.

If the "vicissitudes" of political life are just that and nothing more, as General de Gaulle maintains – in other words, if the Secret Army Organization commanded by Salan (before his capture), Bidault and the Colonels now sees its influence waning and cannot plunge France into anarchy – the French chief of state will at long last be free to carry out the stubbornly maintained program put together on the eve of his return to power on May 13, 1958. (A return which, incidentally, was made possible by the aid, effective as it was naïve, of those whom he is today consigning to prison: the partisans of French Algeria and even of the French Empire.) As to the Secret Army Organization, we shall consider farther on just what its remaining chances are and what predictions may be reasonably made. For the moment, however, let us examine this famous plan for social and international action of de Gaulle's. What about it has caused de Gaulle to enlist the assistance of the prince of French technocrats: Georges Pompidou, a professor of literature, armed with the power of the Bank of Rothschild, as much a dilettante and a realist as Mr. Debré was an impassioned idealist.

In the matter of social development, General de Gaulle has long held that the French Right is creating its own downfall by adhering to a policy of retrogressive conservatism and by its complete blindness to the nature of the modern world. According to de Gaulle, the counterpart in France of the British conservative or the American Republican is not a Rightist, but instead a Socialist. The attachment of French capitalists to their privileges, the sclerosis and imperviousness to change of the French bourgeoisie, according to de Gaulle, simply play into the hands of the Communists and make it easier for the Soviet Union to intervene in French affairs through a solidly organized Communist party. When the pressure of events or the simple fact of natural evolution bring about industrial or agricultural shifts and reforms, in order to modernize French institutions, then serious crises arise – the *Poujadist* movement, for example, or a revolt by the farmers – and these crises are manipulated by the Right in such fashion that the Government is more or less paralyzed. The *Poujadist* movement was originally a protest by small and middle-sized business concerns against unduly onerous taxation and, more especially, against economic planning which paves the way for the demise of the skilled worker to the advantage of the proletarian worker.

Now as General de Gaulle sees it, there is nothing more absurd than this kind of situation in a France which, in 1962, is enjoying fabulous prosperity. At a time like this, when unemployment is practically nonexistent, when wages have risen, when the working man, if "qualified," can expect to own, one by one, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TV set, the refrigerator, and the automatic washer which are the American symbols of well-being; at a time when industry and commerce are rapidly expanding and the Government has a surplus of foreign exchange credits for the first time in 40 years; in a period such as this, the political situation should not bog down in the well-worn ruts of politics-as-usual. Politics should reflect the economic evolution that is occuring, and in no case should the Communist Party remain the active force it is through the trade unions.

It is de Gaulle's opinion that the workers and farmers confine their participation in the public life to mere opposition, airing of grievances, and to isolation, because these social strata do not have sufficient interest in the profits of the firms for which they work. Since 1945 it has been de Gaulle's dream to bring about "the association of capital and labor" – a dream which categorically rejects the concept of the class struggle, the Marxist analysis, and even the Keynesian interpretation of social facts. At the same time, however, de Gaulle appears to lean more and more toward greater government intervention in those areas of public life where inequalities are too glaring. In any event, the Ministers of M. Pompidou's government are already proclaiming that "what has been done for Algeria will be done for the workers too." Can a social revolution be compared to an act of decolonization? I doubt it.

Actually, it is widely thought that henceforth de Gaulle means to exercise his authority in international affairs even more than in the field of domestic social progress. The Algerian conflict had been his Achilles heel, and he knew it. France could not speak up without being reproached for discrediting the West in some part of the Arab world; and whenever a French representative would raise his voice a trifle, he would feel guilty. Moreover, de Gaulle felt that the Algerian affair was unfavorable in every way for his relations with his British and American allies. In his opinion these allies were well satisfied to have so prickly a partner as the President of the French Republic riveted, ball-and-chain, to Algeria. When the cease-fire was proclaimed, it was reported that in both London and Washington the reaction was: "De Gaulle was difficult enough before; now he will become impossible!" He may become very demanding indeed on the most controversial points which have divided the members of the North Atlantic Alliance.

French diplomacy, anticipating its freedom at long last from the Algerian entanglement, is preparing to assert itself on such controversial subjects as: France's autonomy within NATO; its very special concept of European unity; negotiation with the Soviet Union; the pooling of atomic secrets; and, finally, on disarmament. It might even be said that de Gaulle could hope to play a not inconsiderable role in the Middle East and in Africa, were the problem of Israel (regarding which France has undertaken formal commitments) to become somewhat less acute. The liberation of the French diplomats accused of espionage in Cairo by the Egyptian police is without precedent in the behavior of Colonel Nasser, and constitutes a French success directly attributable to the settlement of the Algerian conflict. Already Mr. Sekou Touré of Guinea, the only African state which had said "no" to de Gaulle, is looking toward cooperation with France. Mr. Bourguiba, with his Bizerte base still occupied by France, is proliferating his good will speeches. In short, an auspicious breeze, which may not last but which is very strong at present, is blowing in favor of de Gaulle's France.

But what of that Secret Army Organization which, to this day, has engaged in such fiendish acts as collective and indiscriminate assassination and the murdering of helpless victims lying in hospital clinics? The public trial of General Jouhaud speaks clearly for the state of mind of the last civilian and military partisans of French Algeria. The roots of this crisis go deep into the very soul of a large body of opinion; it can be compared, *mutatis mutandi*, to the crisis which resulted in the American Civil War. How far will the French "Southerners" of Algeria go? Their intentions are well known: in the event of defeat, a scorched-earth policy and a transfer of their revolutionary activity to France.

The scorched-earth campaign has already begun. It is a sign of defeat, and in that sense reassuring, but it will very seriously complicate the task of those who must set up Algeria's provisional institutions. Universities and *lycées* are being destroyed, a campaign to massacre the élite is being attempted, and a program to asphyxiate the entire country is being prepared. It would appear that the combined strength of the loyal French Army and the Algerian Army will suffice to repress these extreme ambitions. However, this can only be done at the price of street-fighting, of battles which will have tragic repercussions in France. When French blood flows freely in the main streets of the European quarters of Algeria and Oran, Paris will not be able to remain indifferent. Even in competitive sports, Paris has always been on the side of the losers. No doubt the Secret Army is counting on this. The Secret Army Organization would like the Europeans to be the victims of a new Budapest. If this were to happen, they say to themselves, the de Gaulle regime will not be able to survive; and the *ultras* could then proceed with purges in France itself. That is their view.

As can be seen, it will not be possible to begin putting into effect the new plans of the French chief of state until the Algerian affair has been more finally concluded than a stroke of the pen can accomplish. Hostilities have not yet been terminated. And so we must wait.

Jean Daniel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On Resuming Tests

Lessons the Moratorium Should Have Taught Us

by Morton H. Halperin

On September 1, 1961, a successfully negotiated nuclear test moratorium came to an end with the first Soviet nuclear explosion. Post-mortems have been numerous since September, and have mostly focused on the "failure" of the moratorium.

Yet between November, 1958, and September, 1961, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union had all abided by an arms control agreement. Whether the results were good or bad, the suspension of testing during this period had an important impact on the arms race. While it did not prevent the French and Chinese from deciding to proceed with the production of nuclear weapons, it seems to have encouraged other nations (such as Sweden and Switzerland) to postpone their decision whether or not to become atomic powers. The suspension of testing also affected the technological race between the US and the Soviet Union. By delaying the development and testing of very small "conventional" tactical nuclear weapons, it may have influenced the policy debate in the US over whether to emphasize conventional or nuclear forces in local defense. The temporary suspension of tests did not, in other words, fail completely. That is the first lesson. But the episode has others, most of which do not seem to have been learned.

All along we have tended to think that arms control agreements will permanently change the arms race, instead of understanding that any agreement (whether informally negotiated like the test ban, or codified into an international treaty) is likely to be altered, if not abandoned, within a few years. Changes in technology may render an agreement obsolete or alter its utility to one or both sides. For example, anti-ICBM systems were not even seriously considered by the US and USSR at the time the two countries agreed to suspend tests. Recent investigations of various novel anti-ICBM systems have provided some of the pressure for new tests on both sides. Similarly, inspection technology has changed, providing new estimates of the likelihood of a successful violation – as well as of its probable importance. The virtual certainty of technical progress thus requires a flexible approach to arms control. Agreements should allow for change, perhaps by establishing a procedure for continuous negotiation on how the arrangement may be altered. We should assume in advance that an arms control agreement, like any other treaty, may have to be renounced if circumstances alter (and we should keep reminding ourselves that circumstances are likely to alter more quickly and unpredictably in military technology than in a great many other areas).

There is a third lesson: inspection proposals ought to take into account what can be found out unilaterally. Only recently has the Administration begun to ask to what extent various international inspection systems would provide new information, rather than simply duplicating information already available to us from CIA and the Pentagon. It is not yet generally appreciated that the placing of seismic stations in the Soviet Union adds almost nothing to our unilateral detection capability. As this journal said editorially last week: "An international organization with its worldwide network of seismic and atmospheric sampling equipment and inspection crews would no more be foolproof in detecting isolated underground tests than our unilateral national apparatus."

Yet, while not denying the value of US intelligence in monitoring an arms control agreement, the Administration has continued to demand an international organization as the price for any treaty, and its price for not resuming tests. This insistence seems to reflect, in part, a belief that arms control is not "real" unless international machinery controls it. To some, in fact, the only apparent value of a test ban, or any other "first-step," would be to create a prototype international organization which might then police bigger disarmament steps. But the Administration should be clear whether it wants international inspection and an international organization because they are required to implement the step under consideration, or only to pave the way for further steps. The two have become so hopelessly tangled in the test ban discussion that now the Administration finds it difficult even to contemplate a nationally-monitored test suspension.

Before last September, analysts in the US had discussed only two ways in which the test moratorium might end: (1) the Soviets might test in secret and the US, discovering this, would renounce the moratorium, or; (2) the US might become tired of Soviet stalling at Geneva and announce it was resuming tests. Neither

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happened. As far as I know, not one analyst anticipated in writing what did happen: public renunciation of the moratorium by the USSR. We had been too preoccupied with the problem of how to learn whether the Soviets were testing in secret.

The sudden Soviet repudiation last September raised the question of whether subsequent agreements, about nuclear tests or other things, might not also be denounced unilaterally and publicly. It then became plain that the problem of sanctions had been neglected. The belief persisted, however, that complete information from an international inspection system would itself be an effective sanction. The Administration also thinks that it would cost the Soviets more to violate an internationally-negotiated treaty than to violate an informal moratorium. Without denying this, I would suggest that the difference is not absolute, nor even necessarily important. Where national security seems threatened, both we and the Soviets are just as likely to renounce an international arms control treaty as the Soviets were to renounce the moratorium.

We have also discovered since September that our power to renounce an arms control agreement if the Soviets do so is not always a satisfactory sanction. It took the US more than six months to be ready to respond to Soviet tests by testing ourselves. In addition, we discovered that since we are still interested in halting *all* tests, this aim is not furthered by our doing as the Russians have done. Some agreements may in fact be unacceptable because we would have no appropriate sanction to apply after a violation.

"You First, Jack"

There is *one* lesson which the Administration claims to have learned. The President seems to have concluded in February that the trouble with previous arrangements was that they provided no inspection of test *preparations*. He thereupon announced that the US would seek inspection of preparations. It turned out, however, that little homework had been done on this problem, and it was impossible, in the short period remaining before the March Geneva conference, for Washington to come up with anything adequate.

But how could our proposals have been adequate? One of the unique things about nuclear testing, and one that should make an agreement easier, is the fact that violations of an agreement are not hard to define. No one is likely to test by accident, by mistake, or because an agreement has been misinterpreted. Thus, negotiators need not haggle over what is being outlawed and what is not. In contrast, the attempt to prevent preparations for testing is exceedingly complex. It is not at all clear where the line is between preparing and not preparing. During the 1958-61 moratorium, both sides worked to develop new weapons systems and new experimental uses for nuclear explosions. Any one of these ventures might well have provided the occasion for a nuclear test. In many respect both we and the Soviets were constantly preparing for tests during this period. No outsider could have said for certain whether our activities were preparations – or merely efforts to advance nuclear technology as far as possible, short of testing. To extend the ban to preparations would mean endless wrangles as each side endeavored to define what was being forbidden.

As for the "Boy Scout oath" by which the US would have heads of government declare that they are not preparing to test, it would probably have much greater impact in the United States than in the Soviet Union. Those in our government who oppose nuclear testing would argue that while a ban on preparations is in effect nuclear laboratories should be shut down, and many activities of the Atomic Energy Commission curtailed. It is doubtful whether such pressure operates in the same way in the Soviet Union. The proper lesson, then, is not, as the Administration seems to think, that agreements should prohibit preparations against the possibility that the treaty will break down, but rather that each side should be equally free to prepare.

To sum up: temporary arms control agreements are not necessarily unsuccessful agreements; arms control treaties must allow for technical progress; inspection is only as important as the new data it provides; inspection is not a sanction; preparations for a treaty's collapse cannot be prohibited. These are the lessons of the moratorium, and they have not been mastered.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Aldous Huxley's Island Paradise

by Patrick O'Donovan

As any proper and delicately nurtured small boy must know, there are dreadful perils in Cleverness. Old people, alas, grow tired of a chatter that is too bright and too long and avoid the little prodigy, perhaps because he bores, or because he represents a reproach to indolence and stupidity or perhaps because he is talking nonsense under the brilliant noise. Anyone of these could be applied to Mr. Huxley. He is for certain, above all a clever writer. He is still a prodigy, still seeks to amaze, still courts rejection.

Island
by Aldous Huxley
(Harper; $4)

His is one of the most astonishing achievements in modern writing. His is an enormous output of novels, plays, essays, poetry, histories and philosophical writing. Between the wars, a new Huxley was a major event and his early novels, his short stories and his first explorations of the mystical experience were for countless young people a massive education in what could be done with the mind, if not with the heart. He earned his place and he became his own legend.

But either he left us or we, as we grew older, left him. And as the going got tougher and the Huxley path plunged even deeper into his private forest, we sometimes gave up the attempt to understand. Occasionally, as in *The Devils of Loudun*, we were back together again, but probably for the wrong reasons. The fact remains that Mr. Huxley has chosen his path and it is one that very few would choose with him. It is so private, so dark, so uncertain of getting anywhere in the end, that his loneliness is hardly a reproach to the old faithful. It is inevitable.

Now, at first sight, he seems to have retraced his footsteps and has gone back to reconsider his subject of the Brave New World. It is true that this is about a paradise rather than a hell on earth, but many of the elements that were used in the first hell and were intended to repel, are now used again in the second paradise and are meant to be admired. This however is no work of optimism. It is a cry of despair from the opposite direction and the view in the end is much the same. There is nothing of comfort here, nothing almost that can be applied to the art or condition of today's sad world – unless its intellectual rejection can be said to represent a salutory slap in the face.

Somewhere in the Indian Ocean there is the lovely and blessed island of Pala. It manages to keep itself to itself, to abstract all that it wants from the world without being contaminated by it. A despairing and cynical English journalist is cast up on its shores. He is potentially a poet and is philosophically wise beyond the habits of the contemporary press. But a knowledge of his own wickedness and a series of tragedies in his past have left him a husk of a man. On Pala, he is cared for and educated and loved and perhaps cured. He is also the helpless instrument for the destruction of this paradise. The outside world – in the form of false emotionalism, of oil interests and tanks and expansionist nationalism – comes crashing in. And in the end nothing is left of the perfect society but some brave souls who have seen the truth and still have it to sustain them.

But it is a very odd paradise and practically its entire population would be liable to charges of various forms of gross indecency in any actual state, though this, of course, is proffered as part of their innocence and maturity.

Pala contains a minimum of machinery and consumer goods, but a splendidly daring agriculture. There is a great deal of mystical practice, but the belief in any sort of Divine Presence is left, tolerantly enough, to those weak enough to find it necessary. There are however frequent sermons, and mushrooms are used to provide artificially induced "religious" experiences. There is a "Yoga of Sex" which provides all the pleasure of love without conception. Families are kept small. Children are allowed within limits to pick and choose their own parents. And everyone talks from the tots to the teachers in an overwhelming torrent of didactic exposition. This sort of thing:

> "Enter the Gods of Light, enter the Prophets, enter Pythagoras and Zoroaster, enter the Jains and the early Buddhists. Between them they usher in the age of the Cosmic Cockfight – Ormuzd versus Ahriman, Jehovah versus Satan and the Baalim, Nirvana as opposed to Samsara, appearance over against Plato's Ideal Reality. And except in the minds of a few Tankriks and Mahayanists and Taoists and heretical Christians, the cockfight went on for the best part of two thousand years."
>
> "After which?" he questioned.
>
> "After which you get the beginnings of modern biology."

Pala was created out of the cooperation of an old Rajah and a self-exiled Scots doctor. People were converted to the new way by the doctor's healing powers and by the Rajah's instinctive understanding of what the doctor was about. It is all based on the voluntary acceptance of what is obviously good. There is no greed, no violence and even death has a certain faint charm about it and scarcely interrupts the flow of talk. But the new Rajah is a vicious, pretty boy and his mother is an old theosophical monster and they long to let in the motor bikes and the diseased religions of the outside world and they succeed.

After reading all this, there seems to be one writer with whom Mr. Huxley may reasonably be compared. He shares with him the same vast bitter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ness and intellectual loneliness, the same pained detachment from his times. He has the same fascinated revulsion from the mechanisms and decays of the body, the same apparent loathing for the human race and a longing to find virtue elsewhere, in specially created societies and situations. Both were reformers and both unable to share the suffering of those they would reform. The other was Dean Swift. Of course, unlike the Dean, Mr. Huxley has never been a classical stylist, is among the most baroque of English writers. But they at least would have understood each other – given time. Dean Swift was relegated by his admirers to being a writer for children; Mr. Huxley has danced himself out of that one.

Indeed this is a curiously distasteful book. The paradise is unreal, uninviting and a bit too much like an experimental clinic with imported Indian overtones in Southern California. Christianity is largely rejected. Selected aspects of Buddhism are incorporated. There is left from all this picking and chosing, a mysticism without God, a love without understanding and a compassion without heart. This is a private paradise and as dangerous as Adam's. You end by feeling rejected. But it does not seem to matter greatly.

RECORDS

The Familiar and the Unfamiliar

Those who heard the concert performances of Gluck's *Iphigénie en Tauride* by the American Opera Society and the Little Orchestra Society discovered that the work had the nobility and beauty of Gluck's more familiar works and that some of the harmonic and orchestral writing achieved extraordinarily dramatic force. No recording has been available to make the work accessible to music-lovers throughout the country; and it is regrettable that the recording now issued on Angel 35632 (mono) and S-35632 (stereo) offers only excerpts. Rita Gorr, in the title role, makes dramatically eloquent use of a powerful mezzo-soprano voice that is metallic in timbre; and the voice of Nicolai Gedda, the Pylades, is unattractive; but the Orestes, Ernest Blanc, and the Thoas, Louis Quilico, are good, and Georges Prêtre conducts effectively a performance which has in addition the Paris Conservatory Concerts Orchestra and the René Duclos Chorus.

As against a Toscanini performance of a Verdi opera, in which the conductor controls singers as well as orchestra in the operation that creates a clear and plastically coherent shape of the total work, and in which the vocal phrases fit into this shape – as against this there is the normal opera-house performance, in which the singing is primary and the shape the conductor creates around it is distorted by the stretched-out vocal phrases and clung-to high notes. The performance of *Aida* on RCA Victor LM- and LSC-6158 is an especially good one of this kind, not only because of the extraordinary beauty and the expressiveness of the expansive singing of Leontyne Price in the title role and Jon Vickers as Rhadames, but because the expansiveness is kept within the limits of the acceptable by the musical taste that is responsible for such unusual details as Vickers' relatively soft high B flat at the end of *"Celeste Aida"* and Price's relatively soft high C at the climax of *"O patria mia."* These details are unusual because they are enormously difficult; and the ease, security and tonal beauty of Price's singing all the way up to the cruelly taxing high notes of this part make her vocal performance a notable one. So with Vickers: the beauty and security of his voice, the continence of his employment of it, the sensitiveness of his inflection of it in the phrase, add up to an exceptional and remarkable performance of the part. As for the other principals, Rita Gorr's powerful but metallic voice can be considered suitable for Amneris; Robert Merrill is a sonorously hoarse-voiced Amonasro; and Giorgio Tozzi, even with some of the velvet gone from his voice, is an effective Ramfis. Georg Solti's pacing of much of the work is leisurely to the point of occasional ineffective slowness. The orchestra and chorus are those of the Rome Opera.

In no performance of Mozart's Requiem that I have heard does the Lacrymosa have the powerful effect that De Sabata creates with the sustained tension of the violins' unceasing two-note figure in his Cetra performance, which unfortunately is poorly reproduced. And in the performance on Telefunken TC-8052 and TCS-18052 the Lacrymosa loses further by its rather fast tempo. But Karl Richter's pacing of the rest of the work is effective; and the performance has good singing by Maria Stader, Hertha Toepper, John van Kesteren, Karl-Christian Kohn and the Munich Bach Chorus, with good playing by the Munich Bach Orchestra.

The originality and power of Musorgsky's matured style in the extended vocal and orchestral writing of *Boris Godunov* are impressive also in the subtly inflected vocal declamation and imaginative piano accompaniments of his later songs, including the best-known *Songs and Dances of Death*. This group and the *Nursery* cycle are on Vanguard VRS-1068 (mono), with their every expressive point made by the soprano Netania Davrath and the pianist Erik Werba; and one hopes that Vanguard intends to issue the *Sunless* cycle, whose songs are among Musorgsky's finest achievements in this genre. The record comes with English translations of the texts; but with vocal writing that follows the words so closely an English transliteration of the Russian is needed to make it possible to know what words each phrase is related to.

The 18th-Century Shakespearean songs by Arne, Haydn and less well-known composers on London OL-50205 and SOL-60036 are engaging; and one, Arne's *Come away, Death*, is outstanding in its beauty and poignancy. They are occasions for lovely and sensitive singing by the soprano Aprile Cantelo, with spirited accompaniments which Raymond Leppard provides alternately on the harpischord and with the English Chamber Orchestra. And the duets sung beautifully by de los Angeles and Fischer-Dieskau on Angel 35963 and S-35963 – by composers ranging from Purcell to Fauré – are pleasant.

A number of engaging harpischord pieces by Couperin are on Vanguard BG-614 (mono); and even more attrac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive are the ones by Rameau on BG-619. Anton Heiller's performances are good, except for an occasional unsteadiness of tempo resulting in lack of rhythmic clarity.

The excitement over Klemperer in England is something I wondered at again as I listened to what his stodgily and ponderously slow performances with the superb Philharmonia Orchestra and Chorus did to the Scherzo, the Intermezzo, the Notturno and other pieces of Mendelssohn's exquisite music for *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, on Angel 35892 and S-35892. The wonder continued as I listened to the similar performance that was no less damaging to Mendelssohn's engaging *Scotch* Symphony, on Angel 35880 and S-35880. Only in Mendelssohn's even more attractive *Italian* Symphony, on Angel 35629 and S-35629, did the tempos produce an acceptable performance (Cantelli's on Angel 35524 is better); but the reverse sides offered another impossibly slow performance of Schumann's Fourth.

After that it is a pleasure to talk about the performances of Mozart's Quartets K.499 and 589 by the Vienna Philharmonic Quartet on London CM-9298 and CS-6231. K.499 – with its richly elaborate opening movement and slow movement, its lovely minuet movement, its comedy finale – is one of Mozart's finest achievements in the genre; and the performance, as sensitively phrased as the Budapest Quartet's, is made superior to it by greater animation and more beautiful tone. And equally fine is the performance of the beautifully wrought K.589.

Fascinating excerpts of Toscanini rehearsals of part of the Overture to *The Magic Flute*, the instrumental recitatives in the last movement of Beethoven's Ninth, and arias and duets from Acts 1 and 2 of *La Traviata* – unfortunately with much unnecessary explanation by Marcia Davenport – are on a record which can be obtained from the Musicians Foundation, 131 Riverside Drive, New York 24.

B. H. Haggin

ART

Ugly Day at the Plaza

A couple of weeks ago the Design Committee of the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects presented, at the Hotel Plaza, what it called hopefully the First Conference on Aesthetic Responsibility. If they don't change the format between now and the next, the first might as well be the last.

The format of the first was like the daily menu at a field mess I used to patronize during World War II. For each day's feeding, the cooks were issued a supply of such staples as Cream-of-Wheat, powdered eggs, creamed beef and Army hash. All of this was cooked up together and divided into three equal portions. These were then labelled "Breakfast," "Dinner" and "Supper" and distributed at appropriate times, at least two of which were always in total darkness, thus adding the element of mystery.

There was also a treat for the troops, the occasional appearance, mixed in the eggs or decorating the hash, of strawberry jam. I am happy to report that the First Conference on Aesthetic Design had jam, too, in the form of an elegant and baffling lunch-hour address by August Heckscher, recently appointed Special White House Consultant on the Arts. Mr. Heckscher roamed gracefully around history, illuminating Plato and Teddy Roosevelt, noting that our recent national preoccupation with Welfare is gradually changing to a preoccupation with "The Public Happiness" and concluding with a plea that the beautiful cities we are presumably so engrossed in building not be allowed to obscure the human worth expressed in the striving for beauty. I am convinced there is a secret meaning there that has so far eluded me. Mr. Heckscher's warning about the dangers of success in the search for aesthetic responsibility seems to imply that success is imminent if indeed not already here. No one else shared this view.

The day, except for lunch, was divided into three panels, each considering, in

What's Really Happening At Geneva?

For a first hand report from the Geneva disarmament conference read the April 2d, 9th and 16th issues of **I. F. Stone's Weekly.** These present a vivid on-the-scene analysis of the sessions plus selections from the speeches of the neutral and smaller powers whose search for a compromise on a test ban and on nuclear testing has been so eagerly reported in the U.S. press. Again Washington's unique four page newsletter demonstrates its capacity to do a more thorough job. You can get these three striking issues free if you use the blank below to start a subscription now, only $5 a year.

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Indispensable for the
Independent Minded

5618 Nebraska Avenue
Washington 15, D. C.

For the enclosed $5 please send me free the three special issues on disarmament from Geneva and enter a 1-year subscription for

Name .....

Street .....

City..... Zone..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory, one aspect of the question of aesthetic responsibility. To make the point, the aspects were stated as questions: "What Are Our Aesthetic Values?," "What Are the Aesthetic Responsibilities of Government, Business and Institutions?" and, for the afternoon, "Who Is Responsible for Ugliness?" Each panel had six speakers, drawn from every field but architecture, and each speaker had ten minutes. The management announced a complicated system of lights, bells and bodily removal to hold everyone to ten minutes.

There were also discussions at the tables holding the 500 or so paying architects and the perhaps 20 non-paying reporters. Following the table discussions there were questions from the tables to the panels. The first question following the first panel seemed to me a good one. After six ten-minute talks under the heading, "What Are Our Aesthetic Values?" a paying architect got up and, after thanking the panelists for their stimulating thoughts, asked plaintively, "But what about those aesthetic values?" Sure enough, a fast check of my notes revealed that no one had mentioned them.

Well, the question got batted around by the panelists and a kind of group explanation emerged: they hadn't talked about our aesthetic values because we don't have any and we don't have any because mass communications have made them impossible. That's the way it goes and that's the way it went for the rest of the day. Eric Larrabee and Russell Lynes, both journalists, produced reasoned, intelligent examinations of the state of the question. Almost everyone else either recounted a bit of his personal experience or else devoted his time to wisecracks, hoping that if the city beautiful did not result from the conference, at least a few good laughs would.

The real dazzler on the program, by the way, was the first speaker of the afternoon session, Ornette Coleman, described as an advanced jazz saxophonist. Mr. Coleman spoke with his saxophone, and at first this seemed a welcome relief from the true confessions and the laugh parade, but it soon became apparent that the musician was following what would have been the main theme of the conference if the conference had been sufficiently organized to have a main theme. He played two tunes, alternating passages of one with passages of the other. The first was way up in the treble some place; the second was way down in the bass. Mr. Coleman would tootle high for a few bars, then burble low; nothing in between and no transitions.

This was essentially what quite a few speakers had to say about the building arts: there were the architects, tootling along to the tune of Excelsior, but always paced by the builders, booming out, Costs, costs, costs, it costs too much. It's an engaging view. And it's a happy land in which all architects aspire to the heights and are frustrated only by frightful builders.

The point of it all became clear when the sponsors, at the end of the day, presented "A Plan for Action." This consists chiefly in getting other AIA chapters to have design committees, like the one in New York, and in getting everyone to lobby in legislatures and in public opinion for the architectural beauty which is within our grasp if we can only fight off the builders.

Perhaps inadvertently, there was one piece of hard news. Daniel Moynihan, assistant to Secretary Goldberg, revealed that a Cabinet Committee is just about on the edge of formulating a policy for the American government in art and architecture. This will be 1) to hire the finest contemporary American architects, 2) to avoid the simultaneous creation of an official style, and 3) to devote a percentage of all architectural commissions to the fine arts. The shocker to this unexceptionable policy is that it hasn't been in force for decades before this. Frank Getlein

THEATER

The Shadow of a Noble Shadow

I often envy my colleague on the movie page his pleasant occupation. He follows a medium pulsing with youthful energy, while the theater puffs and gasps like an exhausted sprinter stumbling toward the last post. But though his job is more consistently enjoyable than mine, I need only remember the masterpieces of recent dramatic literature (not to mention the Greeks and Elizabethans) to come to myself again: I would not trade one for a storage-house of films. The movies inspire one with a sense of promise, the theater with a sense of fulfillment; the one is all future, the other all past. Yet, Antonioni, Bergman, Kurosawa, and the other gifted film-makers of our time, seem no more than interesting neophytes besides such figures as Ibsen, Strindberg, Chekhov, Brecht; and while a modest Hollywood picture provides more true amusement than the most portentous Broadway play, nothing has yet hit celluloid to match the power and complexity of genuine dramatic art. The theater may be dead, but it is certainly haunted by an illustrious army of shadows; and though these shadows mock our present endeavors, they can still invoke in us a sense of awe and possibility.

Rosmersholm
by Henrik Ibsen
Fourth Street Theater

Having thus cheered myself up, I must gloomily admit that the American theater is rarely visited by more than a shadow of a shadow: its infrequent revivals are almost invariably botched. True professionalism, perhaps scenting the end, has begun to abandon our stage; and true interpretive intelligence has never been there. The best we have is good intentions, paving the way to an artistic vacuum. Fearing that the well-intentioned fumblers will soon chase great plays from our stage forever (thus robbing me of my critical *raison d'être*), I am just about ready to swear out writs of injunction – the first one going to David Ross, enjoining him to stay away from Ibsen. Like his two previous assaults on Ibsen's drama, Ross' production of *Rosmersholm* is just finished enough to persuade the reviewers that the play and not the players is the source of the evening's aridities; but the fact is it takes a heap of bungling to make Ibsen's house a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tomb. Examined in the study, *Rosmersholm* is thick and juicy, devious and profound, fleshed with ambiguity and mystery; at the 4th Street Theater, it is thin, starchy, windy, obvious and superficial – a collection of advanced Victorian opinions so watered-down that *The Times* reviewer was stimulated to observe that "we" (*we!*) have grown more "toughminded" than Ibsen!

If the "toughminded" journalists are right, and the play is mainly the author's defense of outmoded opinions about emancipated women, free love, and free thinking, then Mr. Ross' production, for all its inadequacies, is probably justified. For he has directed the play like a stilted melodrama of ideas in which the representative of Conservatism and Evil (Rector Kroll, played by Patrick Waddington in sibilant whispers and archaic stances) combats the representative of Liberalism and Good (Pastor Rosmer, played by Donald Woods like an Ethical Culturist dieting on homogenized milk) against a love story background out of Daphne du Maurier's *Rebecca*. Except for Nancy Wickwire, who, in other circumstances, might have made a strong and willful Rebecca West, nobody even dents the surface of his role; and even her emotional power tends to evaporate in the general blandness of the atmosphere where all wildness has been suppressed and all complexity stifled in the embarrassed gestures of the players.

A cursory glance at the text, however, should convince us that Ibsen is less interested here in ideas than in the people who hold them: in their blindness, conditioning, and guilty secrets. This work he has structured not as an ideological melodrama (like *Enemy of the People*) but as a detective story (like *Ghosts*); and there are enough supernatural hints (*e.g.* the White Horses) to suggest the atmosphere of a ghost story as well. *Rosmersholm*, in short, is not only political, but profoundly psychological, even metaphysical. It is less a drama of broad daylight than of half-lights and shadows – less a brush along the surface than a journey into the hidden soul.

Consider the action. Johannes Rosmer, scion of an influential line of clerics and statesmen, has decided to break with the traditional conservatism and morality of his house. Though vaguely guilty over the suicide of his first wife, Beata, he has fallen under the influence of her emancipated companion Rebecca West. And having repudiated his religious beliefs, he now wishes to devote himself to the ennoblement of mankind. For separate reasons, this brings him in conflict both with the Liberals and the Conservatives; and when he discovers the opportunism and maliciousness of his enemies, his convictions about man's instinctually moral nature are shaken. He loses faith in his ideals altogether when Rebecca confesses that she caused Beata's death – motivated by sexual passion for Rosmer, and exploiting Beata's lesbian passion for her. Declaring that the Rosmer way of life has ennobled her, Rebecca agrees to restore Rosmer's ideals by committing suicide herself, and Rosmer joins her in the millrace. The White Horses appear because the dead have claimed them – not only Beata but Rosmer's ancestors. He has returned, at the end, to their traditional morality – to the concepts of sin and atonement, even without God.

The motives of Rebecca, however, are complicated enough to have inspired speculation by Sigmund Freud who examines her curious refusal to accept Rosmer's earlier marriage proposal, her uncharacteristic confession of guilt, and her sudden acquisition of conscience. Finding the key in the third act revelation that Rebecca had, unknowingly, been the mistress of her own father, Freud concludes that Rebecca admits to a lesser crime (murder) in order to conceal the greater (incest), and turns down Rosmer to avoid repeating this offense. The typical fantasy of the governess, a projection of the Oedipus complex, is to get rid of the mistress and take her place with the master. Rebecca has acted out this fantasy, partly, with Dr. West, and is about to realize it fully with Rosmer; but the incestuous implications of the

---

Notes on Contributors

Patrick O'Donovan *is a foreign correspondent for* The Observer *(London).* Frank Getlein's *newest book,* The Bite of the Print, *will be published by Clarkson N. Potter in the fall.*

"...an absolute revelation... It is a magnificent book."
— Arthur Mizener

EDMUND WILSON'S
Patriotic Gore
STUDIES IN THE LITERATURE OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

Wilson shows what the Civil War meant to those who lived through it. Allan Nevins calls *Patriotic Gore* "a book both rich and fresh, full of accurate portraits of writers and (as with Sherman and Lincoln) historic figures, appraisals of important books and ideas, and perceptive historical interpretations; a strikingly original panorama of the years 1850-1880."
Over 800 pages • $8.50
At all bookstores
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
New York 16

an effort to solve the philosophical problems behind the practical dilemmas of human society

MEN AND NATIONS
by Louis J. Halle,
former adviser on American foreign policy in the U.S. State Department

In a world too small, too heterogeneous, and too explosive to survive basic misunderstandings, the fate of man depends on how men view each other as individuals and as groups. Thus Mr. Halle sees political philosophy as an application of "The Philosophy" which is fundamental for an understanding of life in all its aspects. He develops this philosophy in its relation to politics, taking a step further in the great tradition of Hobbes and Rousseau. $4.75
at your bookseller
Princeton University Press
Princeton, New Jersey

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EUROPE

An unregimented low-cost trip stressing individual liberty & very wide coverage on & off the beaten path from Scandinavia to Africa. Iron Curtain optional. Unless the standard tour is a 'must' for you, write for details.
EUROPE SUMMER TOURS
255 Sequoia, Box N — Pasadena, California

SKY TOP SCHOOL AND CAMP
Blue Ridge Mountains
"An American Summerhill"
Staff of human-type people believes in love, freedom, creativity, joy.
George von Hilsheimer, Director
PO Box 1118, Fort Pierce, Florida

U.S. IN WONDERLAND — New 4-page monthly satirizing the American political and social scene. $2.50 per year. For free sample, write R. Heller, P.O. Box 388, NY 21, NY, enclosing stamped, self-addressed No. 10 envelope.

WORLD DEMOCRACY: By Bin Dir Woor. An American publisher said "It is a book of the century." Other claims: Unique and entrancing. Powerful. Beautiful. Inspiring. "It could transform our earth star." Price $2. GREENWICH BOOK PUBLISHERS, 489 Fifth Ave., New York. Pamphlet miniature of "World Democracy" 10 cents. Address "World Democracy," 15 S. 2nd St., Haines City, Florida.

PERSONALIZED
Stationery – Jewelry — Labels
Free Price Lists
LARSON'S
Box 215-A
Cannon Falls, Minn.

INDIVIDUALISTS AND AUTHORS. Introductory offer. $1.00 brings next three issues of "The Answer," a monthly magazine for Individualists. "The Answer," Box 284, Woodstock, New York.

ATTENTION DEMOCRATS
Millionaire oil tycoons gave $5,000 each to help elect Butler to the Senate. Will you give a fraction of that amount to help elect a Democratic Senator? Send contributions to: Dr. Elbert Byrd for Senate Committee, Box 158-A, Hyattsville, Md.

THE LAST authentic Bucks County, Pa., stone colonial home of such charm left at a price like this. Newly remodeled throughout by well known musician owner. One beautiful acre. Fruit. Cosmopolitan neighborhood. No restrictive clauses. $26,000. Write Box 25, The New Republic.

L'EXPRESS
The leading liberal newspaper in France today.
Send 25c for your sample copy.
Howard Publications
Room 503
1475 Broadway
New York 36, N.Y.

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! $20.95 includes duty and import charges. Delivery in ten days from receipt of order Money back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.

deed infect her will. As for her transformed nature, this, indeed, is the result of her association with Rosmer – just as her Viking amorality stemmed from her association with the free-thinking Dr. West – for rather than being an emancipated woman, she merely takes on the quality of her paternal influence. Incest, lesbianism, murder – these are the crimes which lie concealed beneath the humdrum surface of everyday life, coiled like some prehistoric reptile ready to strike at our illusions of progress, emancipation, and enlightenment. For despite the literal reality of Ibsen's world, he deals in primeval myths; and like the archetypal detective stories (*Oedipus*) and ghost stories (*Hamlet*), *Rosmersholm* is a penetrating tragic work.

Neither this nor anything else of substance is suggested on the 4th Street stage, but I am still not quite prepared to switch my loyalties to the movies. For whatever the actuality, the ideal theater still compels us; and despite the pleasing surface of the films, it is in the depth of the drama that the human soul is revealed.

ROBERT BRUSTEIN

Correspondence

Which Revolution for Brazil?

Sirs:

Although it will reach you very late, I want to register a strong protest against "Which Revolution for Brazil?" by Louis L. Wiznitzer, in your March 19 issue. . . . I am an American but I have lived in Brazil for almost 10 years. During the past year I have been working on a book about Brazil and I have had talks with reputable journalists, economists, and international lawyers in Rio de Janeiro. These people, and all my Brazilian friends, are pro-democracy and pro-United States – or they would like to be pro-United States; it is really up to us where their sympathies turn. I don't believe you have any idea of the repercussions this malicious article can have here, besides the distorted view it gives your American readers of the Brazilian situation and its personalities.

It would take an article longer than Mr. Wiznitzer's to separate his truths from his falsehoods. (Even his minor details are strangely inaccurate.) However – a month has gone by, and far from "a vast majority of all classes" supporting the return of Janio Quadros to power, as he says, the disillusionment with Quadros seems general. The brief and local wave of terrorism last February has not been officially cleared up, but it has not been proved to have any connection with Carlos Lacerda, governor of the state of Guanabara. (I have known Lacerda personally for 10 years and the idea of him as a "terrorist" is absurd.) As former leader of the opposition, the man directly responsible for the downfall of Vargas, and indirectly responsible for the neurotic flight of President Quadros, Lacerda naturally has many enemies. But even his enemies usually recognize his honesty. Mr. Wiznitzer's stories of Lacerda's "blackmailing" Quadros and selling government property as real estate, exactly follow the line of Communist propaganda here.

Mr. Wiznitzer says, "in the past 12 months the masses of people have been made politically conscious." This is nonsense; they are not politically conscious at all, and it will be many, many years before they are. It is because, in their poverty and misery, they are still politically completely ignorant, that they are at the mercy of political opportunists – and malicious tale-spreaders like Mr. Wiznitzer.

His last paragraph, giving Brazil a choice between "democratic socialism plus neutralism" and "Communism plus anti-Americanism" is unfortunately probably his most accurate. That is why I would like to see you print more careful, informative, and honest estimates of the dangerous situation here, a situation that may become of crucial importance to the United States at any moment.

Elizabeth Bishop
Petropolis, Brazil

Why Dailies Die

Sirs:

A week before the appearance of "Why Dailies Die" by Ben Bagdikian (April 16), I was discussing with students in one of my courses the very problems he cogently describes. His piece was so impressive that I read parts of it to the class; we talked about it, and that issue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of *The New Republic* was made required reading.

Of course Mr. Bagdikian could not take up all the reasons for the death of newspapers, nor have A. J. Liebling or Carl Lindstrom. Having lost *The Detroit Times* about a year and a half ago, and with rumors – hotly denied – that *The Free Press* is in economic trouble (at this very moment it is struck by the Teamsters and is not being published), Detroiters are perhaps oversensitive on the subject of decaying journalism.

Could another reason be that readers have lost confidence in their ad-filled and news-squeezed dailies? In their desire to be open-minded, objective and impartial, and in trying to satisfy all customers, have newspapers lost readers on every side?

For example, *The Detroit News* must have pleased many upright citizens on April 4 with this editorial, headed "Liz's Bed and Board":

> "Judge not, that ye be not judged, thought the philosopher as he contemplated the activities of Elizabeth Taylor . . . The amateur moralist, noting that the lady conforms to the legalism of divorce and the institutionalism of holy wedlock, wonders once more as to the folkways of Hollywood: Why do they bother?"

But two days later, on April 6, *The News* printed Dorothy Kilgallen's daily column under the headline, "Liz had Help in Setting Trap":

> "One of the first to know about the Elizabeth Taylor-Richard Burton romance was Bricktop, the American expatriate who now runs a night club on the Via Veneto in Rome and has been a darling of the International Set since way back in the days when the Duke of Windsor was Prince of Wales. Brick has become popular in Italy not only for her entertaining but for her devotion to religious causes and her generosity in helping Italian charities. Liz trusted her, and very few others, during the early stages of the idyll with Burton, and would telephone Bricktop to ask her to deliver the finest foods and wines to their secret trysting place.
>
> "Sometimes when Liz and Burton were in the mood to go night clubbing, Brick would get the word and she'd empty her cafe, darken it, and stand guard against gossipy intruders while the lovers nuzzled over their vino.
>
> "At this point Liz was not only 'bored with Eddie' but fascinated by the strong-minded, intelligent Burton, and confident of her ability to lure him into her web permanently (not that 'permanent' is her favorite word) if she just had enough time to see him in privacy."

This disgusting claptrap – linking religious causes, Italian charities and idyllic romance with what Elizabeth Taylor and "strong-minded, intelligent" Richard Burton were doing when they were not gliding down their Romanesque Nile – must have pleased *The News* readers who read the papers for other things than what's going on in the Congo or US Steel board meetings.

Some wonder why *The News* didn't simply drop Dorothy Kilgallen's cheap column. Others, if they read the editorial page at all, may have thought the editorial was stuffy.

Is the newspaper trying to spread its wings too wide? Instead of catching birds of all feathers, is it losing them?

William White
Professor of Journalism
Wayne State University

Language and Usage

Sirs:

Your editorial paragraphs "It Ain't Right" (April 23, 1962) exhibit a position on language so backward as to be almost shocking in a magazine whose judgments are usually so informed.

Samuel Johnson was among the first who had pretensions toward linguistic legislation. In 1755 he published a "prescriptive" dictionary which set the trend for the next hundred years or so, a trend which your comments show is still not dead. Johnson rather dolefully recorded in the preface to his dictionary that he had once "flattered" himself that the tide of language change could be stemmed, but that he now saw he had "indulged expectation which neither reason nor experience can justify." Subsequent history has confirmed Johnson's chastened observations. Lan-

Any Book

Out-of-print books located—no matter how old or long out-of-print. Name the book—we'll find it for you! (Title alone is sufficient.) All authors, subjects. Fiction, nonfiction. No obligation.

Books-On-File
Dept. NEW Union City, N.J.

JEUNE
AFRIQUE

The liberal voice of emerging Africa.
Edited in Tunis, in French. Send 25c for your copy.
HOWARD PUBLICATIONS
Room 503, 1475 Broadway, New York 36

NORTH DAKOTA GOES DEMOCRATIC — The fascinating, inside story of the liberal struggle in North Dakota that broke 50 years of Republican domination now documented in a new, hardbound 252-page book, INSURGENTS. Mail orders: $4.95 to INSURGENTS, Box 721, Bismarck, N. D.

"WILL FORMS"
Two Will Forms and Book on Wills.
$1.00 Complete
National Forms, Box 48313NR
Los Angeles 48, Calif.

EXPERIMENT WITH "SLEEP-LEARNING"
Self-hypnosis. Use your phonograph, recorder.
Fascinating, educational. Details free.
Sleep-Learning Research Association
Box 24-NR Olympia, Washington

HOW MUCH DO YOU DRIVE?
Tired of all that junk on am radio? Here's your answer! Granco fm car radio converter with automatic frequency control. 12 volts only, easy to install. Suggested retail price $49.50. Now only $42.50 post paid. Satisfaction guaranteed or money back. Send for free discount price list.
New Company, Retail Distributors
212 16033 Ventura Blvd., Encino, Cal.

NEED A BATH with golden faucets? Is the new, completely remodeled studio apartment in my home on the Delaware in Bucks County, Pa., your dream? Could be, if you're that interesting a person. Rent and relax—write your book, hang your exhibit or just commute over your private canal bridge to the pickle works. Separate entrance—perfect privacy. $100 monthly, utilities included. VO 2-2170 after 7 p.m. or weekends, or write Box 15, The New Republic.

HAVE YOU OUTGROWN GODS, SAVIORS AND SUPERNATURALISM?
Is all your concern for people? Then you're a HUMANIST! Welcome to AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION; local chapters, publications. Send $1 for three-month trial membership ($5 for year):
AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION
Dept. NR, Yellow Springs, Ohio

Printed by National Publishing Co., 301 N St., N.E., Washington 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she has a right to live

Tran Thi Tinh, Vietnamese, age 12. Father killed in Communist ambush. Mother left with four children. Youngest born after father's death. Mother still unable to work. Family lives in mud hut 10 x 10 feet. One bed and crude shelves. Tinh cannot afford to go to school. Stays home and cares for infant. All children hungry. Mother desparate. Situation acute. Help urgent.

You or your group can become a Foster Parent of a needy child. You will be sent the case history and photo of your "adopted" child and letters from the child himself. Correspondence is translated by Plan. The child knows who you are. At once he is touched by love and a sense of belonging. Your pledge provides new clothing, blankets, food packages, education and medical care, as well as a cash grant of $8.00 every month. Each child receives full measure of material aid from your contribution. Distribution of goods is supervised by Plan Staff and is insured against loss in every country where Plan operates. **Help in the responsible way. "Adopt" a child through Foster Parents' Plan. Let some child love you.**

Plan is non-political, non-profit, non-sectarian, government approved independent relief organization, registered under No. VFA019 with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the United States Government and filed with the National Information Bureau in New York City. **We eagerly offer our financial statement on request because we are so proud of the handling of our funds.** Plan helps children in France, Italy, Greece, South Korea, Viet Nam, Hong Kong, and the Philippines. © 1962 F.P.P.

Foster Parents' Plan, Inc.

352 PARK AVENUE SOUTH, NEW YORK 10, N.Y. • FOUNDED 1937

MRS. JOHN F. KENNEDY, Honorary Chairman 25th Anniversary Campaign

PARTIAL LIST of SPONSORS and FOSTER PARENTS

Steve Allen
Bing Crosby
K. C. Gifford
Helen Hayes
Dr. John Haynes Holmes
Charles R. Hook
C. D. Jackson
Gov. & Mrs. Walter Kohler
Garry Moore
Edward R. Murrow
Mary Pickford
Dr. Howard A. Rusk
Mr. & Mrs. Robert Sarnoff

FOSTER PARENTS' PLAN, INC. **NR-4-62**
352 Park Avenue South, New York 10, N. Y.
In Canada: P.O. Box 65, Sta. B, Montreal, Que.

A. I wish to become a Foster Parent of a needy child for one year or more. If possible, sex....., age....., nationality.....

I will pay $15 a month for one year or more ($180 per year). Payment will be monthly ☐, quarterly ☐, semi-annually ☐, yearly ☐.

I enclose herewith my first payment $.....

B. I cannot "adopt" a child, but I would like to help a child by contributing $.....

Name.....

Address.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

Date..... Contributions are Income Tax deductible.

guage develops in a kind of sublime indifference to prescriptive efforts. If "bimonthly" is ambiguous, we will still communicate somehow. Tens of thousands of words in our language have multiple meanings.

Unsound both linguistically and anthropologically is your idea that "primitive, vague, and illogical" language leads to loose thinking. Language characteristics are a kind of mirror of group thought patterns, not *vice versa*. Some African tribes have no word to distinguish "father" from "uncle." This shows something about cultural orientation, but nothing about precision of thought.

In the light of linguistic knowledge it is doubtful that any publisher will soon attempt your "new discriminating dictionary of the American language." Alas, "discriminating" from whose point of view? Yours? Dr. Gove's? Mine? Dr. Johnson's? The only genuine standard of "correctness" there has ever been has been prevailing usage. Linguists and Dr. Gove did not invent this situation. They just admit it.

Joseph C. Beaver
Hastings, Nebraska

Sirs:

You have a most valuable suggestion in your April 23 issue, that the great foundations endow the drafting of a dictionary which accepts responsibility and gives definitions, rather than merely reports what its compliers suppose people mean, by what it finds some of them saying.

The extraction of sense from language is difficult enough, as it is. Unless somebody is willing to be arbitrary and disciplinary about it, we are left in a hopeless condition. It is ridiculous for anybody calling himself an editor to refuse to edit. You could do all of us a service by going into this matter at length and finding out just why some people hold that dictionaries "should be descriptive, not prescriptive." How did this "should" get to control the thinking of any word monger, that he could bring himself to say a dictionary must have no traffic with "artificial" notions of correctness or superiority? Is this an argument that "one word is as good as another," or that notions of correctness and superiority, of necessity, are artificial? *Frank C. Waldrop*
Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED